



## **Cabinet: supplementary – minutes and budget appendices (re equalities and consultation)**

**Monday 8 February 2016 at 7.00 pm**

Board Room 4 - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,  
Wembley HA9 0FJ

### **Membership:**

#### **Lead Member Councillors:**

#### **Portfolio**

Butt (Chair)  
Pavey (Vice-Chair)  
Denselow  
Hirani  
Mashari  
McLennan  
Moher  
Southwood

Leader of the Council  
Deputy Leader of the Council  
Lead Member for Stronger Communities  
Lead Member for Adults, Health and Well-being  
Lead Member for Employment and Skills  
Lead Member for Housing and Development  
Lead Member for Children and Young People  
Lead Member for Environment

**For further information contact:** Anne Reid, Principal Democratic Services Officer  
020 8937 1359, [anne.reid@brent.gov.uk](mailto:anne.reid@brent.gov.uk)

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:

**[democracy.brent.gov.uk](http://democracy.brent.gov.uk)**

**The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting**

# Agenda - supplementary – minutes and budget appendices

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence.

Item	Page
2 Minutes of the previous meeting	1 - 10
4 Appendices to sections 8 and 9 of Budget 2016/17 and Council Tax report	11 - 38

**Ward Affected:**  
All Wards

**Lead Member:** Councillor Pavey  
**Contact Officer:** Conrad Hall, Chief Finance Officer  
Tel: 020 8937 6528 [conrad.hall@brent.gov.uk](mailto:conrad.hall@brent.gov.uk)

**Date of the next meeting:** Monday 14 March 2016



- Please remember to set your mobile phone to silent during the meeting.
- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public.



## LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

### MINUTES OF THE CABINET Wednesday 20 January 2016 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Butt (Chair), Councillor Pavey (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Denselow, Hirani, Mashari, McLennan, Moher and Southwood

Also present: Councillors Kelcher, Perrin and Stopp

1. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

None made.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 December 2016 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. **Matters arising**

None.

4. **Authority to market Tenterden Pavilion under the Council's Community Asset Transfer (CAT) Policy**

Councillor Butt welcomed Mr David Daniels and Mr David Pearson to the meeting and invited them to present their deputation.

Mr Daniels informed Cabinet that he spoke on behalf of a number of Tenterden Area Local Residents. Mr Daniels stated that, whilst he welcomed the proposal being made, there is a critical issue relating to Anti-Social Behaviour which the Cabinet should be aware of, if not already.

Mr Daniels reported that, thanks to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Butt, and Councillor Pavey, in his capacity as Barnhil Ward Councillor, much anti-social behaviour had now been eliminated in the area close to the Pavilion.

Councillor McLennan, Cabinet Member for Housing and Development, introduced the report stating that through the Council's Community Asset Transfer (CAT) policy, the Tenterden Sports Pavilion and associated playing fields was the subject of an Expression of Interest (EOI) by Forest United (1973) Youth Football Club Limited. She stated that this EOI has been evaluated and has passed the relevant

tests as outlined in the CAT policy. The next step of the decision making process is for Cabinet to grant authority to market the asset as a CAT opportunity.

Councillor McLennan stated that the CAT policy had been launched in July 2015. It outlined a framework that supports the identification, transfer and sustainable management of Council assets by Third Sector Organisations (TSOs). It encouraged TSOs to approach the Council with proposals for assets by submitting a completed Expression of Interest (EOI) template, which summarised their vision for the asset including how the intended use and supported Borough Plan 2015-19 priorities.

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) that the marketing of the Tenterden Pavilion and associated playing fields be approved as a CAT opportunity;
- (ii) that it be noted that the subsequent granting of the lease will be to the preferred CAT bidder, following marketing through a non binding informal tender process with the final decision to let the asset on the agreed terms to be approved by Cabinet;
- (iii) that officers advertise in the local newspaper in accordance with Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 the land shown edged red on the Site Plan Appendix III attached to the report and in the event of objections they be considered by the Strategic Director unless in the opinion of the Strategic Director significant objections are received in which case this should be reported back to the Cabinet for consideration;
- (iv) that a planning condition be included that stipulated that no area associated with the Pavilion should be left available when the facility is not in use and that the design of the new facility should be developed to discourage any anti-social behaviour.

**5. Scrutiny Task Group on Closed Circuit Television (CCTV)**

Councillor Kelcher, Chair of Scrutiny, presented the report of the scrutiny task group established to look at CCTV. The task group was established by the Scrutiny Members in response to Brent residents' requests for increased levels of CCTV in the borough.

Councillor Kelcher stated that the purpose of the task group was to analyse and understand the effectiveness of CCTV in Brent and its impact on reducing anti-social behaviour crime, and, to review policies and processes in comparison to others and best practice.

The review was concerned with the perception and attitudes of residents, and, the deterrence of crime for Brent communities. The review also focused on apprehending offenders, costs and alternative funding and the levels of reassurance given to residents.

The review is aligned with borough priorities, such as 'Working in partnership with citizens and building stronger residents and council relationships'. And 'Continuing to reduce crime and making people feel safer'.

Councillor Butt, Leader of the Council, thanked Councillor Kelcher for his introduction and, on behalf of his Cabinet colleagues, welcomed the report.

Councillor Denselow, Cabinet Member for Stronger Communities, welcomed the report stating that the Cabinet would be able to adopt all of the recommendations made by the Task Group.

Councillor Mashari, Cabinet Member for Employment and Skills, praised the task group on its report stating that ward councillors regularly received a significant number of requests for additional CCTV.

Councillor Butt, Leader of the Council, stated that he had recently shadowed the CCTV team which deserved the praise highlighted by the scrutiny report.

RESOLVED:

that the 22 recommendations made by the task group be approved and support be extended to the development of an action plan across the council and partner organisations to take these forward.

**6. National Non Domestic Rates - Applications for discretionary rate relief and London Living Wage discretionary discount**

Councillor Mashari, Lead Member for Employment and Skills, introduced the report stating that the council has the discretion to award rate relief to charities or non-profit making bodies. It also has the discretion to remit an individual National Non-Domestic Rate (NNDR) liability in whole or in part on the grounds of hardship.

Councillor Mashari stated that the award of discretionary rate relief was based on policy and criteria agreed by the Executive in September 2013. New applications for relief have to be approved by the Cabinet. The report detailed new applications for relief received since the Cabinet last considered such applications on 21 September 2015.

Councillor Mashari reminded members that the Cabinet agreed at its meeting on 26 January 2015 to award a Business Rates discount to companies who agreed to pay its employees the London Living Wage and who became accredited with the Living Wage Foundation. The level of discount was 5 times the costs of accreditation, 30% of the cost of the discount is borne by the council. This scheme was introduced for 12 months, from 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016, it was agreed a review would be carried out once the scheme had been operational for 12 months.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the applications for discretionary rate relief detailed in Appendices 2 and 3 to the report be approved;

- (ii) that the discretionary discount scheme for businesses accredited to the London Living Wage Foundation be extended for a further 6 months, from 1 April 2016 to 30 September 2016 on the basis that the Business Rates discount will continue to be five times the cost of accreditation and will be awarded to businesses in Brent which become accredited with the Living Wage Foundation and who meet the criteria detailed in Appendix 4 of the report;
- (iii) that approval of this scheme is pursuant to the Council's powers under section 47 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 and that this proposal is considered reasonable having regard to the interests of those persons who are liable to pay council tax in the borough of Brent and that a further report be submitted once the scheme is reviewed in May/June 2016.

**7. Extension of Contract for Hosting and Support for Oracle eBusiness Suite (oneOracle)**

Councillor Pavey, Deputy Leader of the Council, introduced the report stating that the report sought authority to extend the contract for hosting and support for the Oracle eBusiness Suite (oneOracle).

RESOLVED:

that an extension of the contract for hosting and support for the Oracle eBusiness Suite (oneOracle) to Cap Gemini for 2 years from August 2016 be approved.

**8. 2015 Report of the Director of Public Health**

Councillor Butt welcomed Mr Martin Francis to the meeting and invited him to present his deputation. Mr Francis spoke about instances of tooth decay and the high levels of obesity in the borough in Under 5s.

Councillor Hirani, Cabinet Member for Adults, Health and Well-being, thanked Mr Francis for his contribution. He stated that Brent could be proud of the low numbers of pregnant women that smoked and the breastfeeding rates were higher than average. He also stated that there had been a dramatic decrease in the number of teenage pregnancies in Brent. Councillor Hirani highlighted to Members that childhood obesity and tooth decay were still a concern not only for children now, but the potential health problems this could lead to as they got older. He stated that a project taking community dentists into schools to give check-ups to children and to inform their families of the dental services available to them across was starting to make a difference.

RESOLVED:

that the 2015 report from the Director of Public Health which considered the health of the Under 5s in Brent be noted.

**9. Scrutiny Task Group on Fly-tipping**

Councillor Stopp, stated that this task group had been established by the Scrutiny Members in response to communicated concerns from Brent residents regarding increased fly-tipping levels.

The purpose of the task group was to analyse and understand the borough's knowledge, behaviour and understanding of fly-tipping, and, to review local fly-tipping policies and processes of the council and its partners.

Councillor Stopp stated that the review was concerned with reducing the levels of fly-tipping in Brent and ensuring clean and safe environments for Brent residents; and as a result, a reduction in clean-up and enforcement costs. The review also focused on the borough priorities, such as working in partnership with citizens and building stronger resident's and council relationships.

He stated that 'making sure that Brent was an attractive place to live, with a pleasant environment, clean streets, well-cared for parks and green spaces' was an objective within the Council's Borough Plan. Ensuring that fly tipping was reduced and in the long term eradicated was a widely backed element within the context of our "Better Place" priorities.

Councillor Stopp stated that the review focussed on a top-to-bottom analysis of Brent Council's internal and external processes for dealing with fly-tipping. Key areas of focus were agreed during the work of the task group, these included knowledge, education, enforcement, impact, publicity.

Councillor Stopp suggested the possible re-launch of the Cleaner Brent app.

Councillor Southwood, Cabinet Member for Environment, thanked Councillor Stopp and the task group members for their work and the final report.

Councillor Stopp highlighted that the task group recommended that the term "Fly-tipping" should be changed to "Illegal Rubbish Dumping" (IRD) in communications with residents. Residents rarely refer to dumped rubbish as fly-tipping and there is apparently confusion among some residents about what "fly-tipping" actually meant.

Councillor Butt, Leader of the Council, thanked Councillor Stop for his work with the Task Group and praised the work of residents' groups such as Keep Wembley Tidy which could be a model to adopt across the borough.

RESOLVED:

that the 26 recommendations made by the task group be approved support be extended to the development of an action plan across the council and partner organisations to take these forward.

10. **Agreement to extend the London North West Healthcare NHS Trust contract for health visiting (HV) and Family Nurse Partnership (FNP )**

Councillor Butt asked Mr Martin Francis to present his deputation which highlighted 0-5 children's public health services.

Councillor Hirani, Cabinet Member for Adults, Health and Well-being, stated that the responsibility for commissioning of 0-5 children's public health services transferred from NHS England (NHSE) to local authorities on 1st October 2015. The contract for Health Visiting and Family Nurse Partnership (FNP) services for Brent was held with London North West Healthcare Trust (LNWHT).

Councillor Hirani stated that the current contract was due to expire at the end of March 2016. The contract between the Council and LNWHT for the six month period had a value of £2,563,000. The Local Authority has a statutory responsibility to ensure the provision of a health visiting service: the mandated requirements were set out at paragraph. These elements are mandated until March 2017.

Councillor Hirani informed colleagues that the contract with the current provider, LNWHT could be extended to maintain the current service provision by continuing the current (DH specified) service specification and issuing of a local authority contract for the period from 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017 with an annual value of £5,126,000. The resource for the commissioning of these services will be part of the Public Health grant.

RESOLVED:

that the extension of the service provision with LNWHT for 0-5 children's health services for health visiting and FNP from 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2017 be approved on the Department of Health's Public Health terms and conditions for public authorities.

**11. West London Alliance Accreditation Purchasing and Contract Management (APC) Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS)**

The report circulated under this title was withdrawn. See meeting to be held on 8 February 2016.

**12. Housing Tenancy Conversions**

Councillor McLennan, Cabinet Member for Housing and Development, introduced the report stating that the Council's Housing Private Finance Initiative (PFI) project provides 364 units of Temporary Accommodation (TA) for homeless households and 20 units of residential care accommodation through contractual arrangements running until 2028.

It was originally intended that a rising proportion of the TA units would be converted to Social Rented properties over the course of the contract (temporary to permanent conversions), in order to provide settled accommodation for at least 158 households by the end of the contract.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that it be noted that the revised Project Agreement was entered into in April 2015;
- (ii) that it be noted that the projected financial deficit at the end of the contract, without exercising the option to convert PFI units to alternative tenures, has



increased due to the impact of external factors since the last report to Cabinet;

- (iii) that up to 122 units of Temporary Accommodation be converted to 'Discounted Market Rent units, as set out in the report, and the Strategic Director Community Well-being, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and the Chief Legal Officer be delegated authority to issue to Brent Coefficient Limited a schedule setting out the units to be allocated as Discounted Market Rent units in accordance with the Project Agreement.

### **13. Times House and the Falcon Public House, South Kilburn - acquisition financing proposals**

Councillor McLennan, Cabinet Member for Housing and Development, introduced the report reminding members that, in accordance with Brent's Executive approval in 2011, site assembly was planned in order to deliver proposals in respect of the South Kilburn regeneration programme, including the compulsory purchase of the Genesis owned Keniston Press, and the Greene King Retailing Limited owned Falcon Public House site.

Councillor McLennan stated that as these acquisitions were programmed in future years, the report sought approval to bring land assembly forward, setting out the background, property information and options.

The Cabinet also had before them an appendix to the report which was not for publication as it contained the following category of exempt information as specified in Schedule 12 of the Local Government (Access to Information Act) 1972:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) that authority be granted to acquire Times House, 50 Claremont Road, London W9 3DZ, (the Keniston Press site), this financial year 2015/16, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report (not for publication);
- (ii) that authority be granted to acquire The Falcon Public House, 341 Kilburn Lane, London W9 3EG site, this financial year 2015/16, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report;.
- (iii) that the Strategic Director of Resources, in consultation with the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment and the Chief Finance Officer be delegated authority to finalise the terms of the proposed acquisitions and enter into any associated agreements and contracts.

### **14. Church End redevelopment update and investment proposals**

Councillor McLennan, Cabinet Member for Housing and Development, introduced the report stating that the Cabinet decision on 11 March 2013, approved redevelopment plans at the Church End Car Park (the subject site), a site that is in dual ownership between the Council and Catalyst Housing, this report provides an

update. She stated that since approval, the Council has adopted the Strategic Property Plan 2015-19, that set out a presumption for Brent to retain its limited property assets, utilising them to support regeneration and for income generation, Church End was one of the Borough's five designated growth areas. This report proposed that capital investment be approved to enable Brent to implement the current planning consent, delivering 34 new homes, retail, and a new market square.

The report proposed bringing forward the development of both land parcels (the Council and Catalyst lands) concurrently, thus significantly reducing delivery time, this would require the termination of the existing market arrangement and its replacement through the period of redevelopment by a new facility at Neasden.

A report would be brought forward to Cabinet in March 2016 seeking authorisation for the procurement of a contractor to deliver the scheme.

Councillors Hirani and Mashari welcomed the report stating this was a fantastic opportunity for the area.

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) that capital investment of £8.2m be made to bring forward the 34 planning consented homes on the Council's portion of the site, comprising 33 flats for sale or rent and 1 affordable home along, with the non-residential floorspace and a market square, subject to resolving planning requirements.
- (ii) that the Strategic Director of Resources in consultation with the Chief Legal Officer and Chief Finance Officer be authorised to appropriate the land shown coloured pink and green on the plan in Appendix [1] to the report, comprising the Church End Car Park and other land to be acquired by the Council by agreement or compulsory purchase ("the Site") for the planning purposes of facilitating the development or redevelopment of the Site when the Church End Car Park is no longer required for the purposes for which it is held immediately before appropriation pursuant to the provisions of section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972.
- (iii) that officers make a submission to the General Purposes Committee, to stop up the paths on the car park site and landscaped area; that Eric Road remains as Public Highway; and that the new market square site will be adopted as Public Highway, as outlined in Appendix 2 to the report;
- (iv) that it be noted that Officers are still pursuing the CPO and land swap as detailed in the March 2013 report to Cabinet, but that the funding arrangements have changed as outlined in Section 4 of the report;
- (v) that it be noted that the existing Church End market arrangements will be terminated and that a replacement market facility is proposed in Neasden Town Centre, that the existing market operator has been informed, and that following Cabinet approval a consultation exercise will be undertaken with stall holders.

**15. Brent Cycle Strategy**

Councillor Southwood, Cabinet Member for Environment, introduced the report informing Members that the Strategy has been developed to provide a transparent framework from which works to increase the number of people cycling will be implemented as well as prioritise investment for cycling throughout the borough.

Councillor Southwood stated that priorities and objectives have been developed following consultation with residents and key stakeholders regarding cycling in the borough which also reflect the priorities and objectives set out in the Borough Plan and the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

The priorities and objectives of the cycle strategy when implemented will also complement and support the Long Term Transport Strategy (LTTS) as well as work of other service areas such as Public Health and Air Quality.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the consultation be noted;
- (ii) that the Brent Cycle Strategy as set out in Appendix A to the report be approved;
- (iii) that the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Environment, in liaison with the Lead Member for Environment be authorised to approval the final content of the strategy, including design.

**16. Authority to award contracts for the supply of Street Lighting LED lanterns and Central Management System**

Councillor Southwood, Cabinet Member for Environment, presented the report explaining that the report requested authority to award contracts as required by Contract Standing Order No 88. The report summarises the process undertaken in tendering these contracts and, following the completion of tender evaluation, recommends to whom the contracts should be awarded.

The report also measured the success of the tendering exercise against the business case for investment set out in the Cabinet Report Street Lighting: Energy and Carbon Savings Proposals - authority to tender, 14 April 2014.

Councillor Mashari, Cabinet Member for Employment and Skills, welcomed the report highlighting the savings to be made from electricity expenditure and the potential reduction in carbon emissions.

Conrad Hall, Chief Finance Officer, highlighted the financial implications set out in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.13. He stated that the business case for investing in LED and CMS estimated that the Council would need to make provision for £7.725m of capital funding. This estimate was inclusive of the supply of equipment and installation costs, with responsibility for installation falling to the council's PFI sub contractor, Bouygues.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the procurement process followed by the council to secure value for money from the supply of LED luminaires and an associated Central Management System be noted;
- (ii) that the contract for the supply of LED (Lot 1 Light Emitting Diode) Street lighting luminaires be awarded to Bouygues E&S Infrastructure UK Limited, on the basis that the tender was the Most Economically Advantageous Tender, and surpassed the business case recommendations outlined to Cabinet in April 2015;
- (iii) that a contract for the supply of a CMS (Lot 2 Central Management System) be awarded to DW Windsor Limited, on the basis that the tender was the Most Economically Advantageous Tender, and surpassed the business case reported to Cabinet in April 2015;
- (iv) that the installation of procured equipment by the council's Private Finance Initiative (PFI) sub-contractor, Bouygues E&S Infrastructure UK Limited, be authorised within a programme expected to last approximately 14 months, commencing in April 2016;
- (v) that the Operational Director (Community Services), in consultation with the Lead Member for Environment and relevant ward Members, be authorised to make appropriate adjustments to lighting levels using CMS at a localised level in response to traffic and pedestrian needs, subject to budget provision;
- (vi) that the Chief Finance Officer be authorised to secure the capital required to deliver this project, noting the financial implications set out in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.13 of the report;
- (vii) that a draft Lighting Plan be developed, for recommendation to Cabinet in 2016/17, which will set out options for how the council could achieve further savings of at least 10% from energy costs and carbon emissions, and addressing:
  - road safety objectives;
  - community safety perceptions; and
  - residents' and visitors' travel choices.

**17. Reference of item considered by Scrutiny Committee**

None.

**18. Any other urgent business**

None.

The meeting ended at 8.40 pm

M BUTT  
Chair

# Equality Analysis Screening Forms

## Driving Organisational Efficiency

<b>Reference:</b>	DOE001
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	Support Planning, Reablement, Mental Health
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Councillor Hirani

<b>Savings Proposals:</b>	Increased use of direct payments
---------------------------	----------------------------------

### **1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

The objective is to increase the take-up of Direct Payments, where service users pay for their home care/community support through independent Personal Assistants or direct purchasing of support from providers, instead of the council purchasing this on their behalf. Direct Payments provide more choice for service users and offers them the option to increase the degree to which their care reflects their individual needs. Increasing the take-up of Direct Payments also places more responsibility and additional transactions on the service user or their carer, which may present challenges for some service users. However, Direct Payments remain a choice for service users and there are support services available and options for others to manage Direct Payments on their behalf to mitigate these challenges and ensure that it is possible to benefit from Direct Payments regardless of capability or equality characteristics.

Increasing uptake is needed as the council has a legal obligation as a result of the Care Act to consider individuals' wellbeing and provide more choice to allow for more personalised care. Additionally, increased use of Direct Payments will provide savings against the traditional model of delivering care at a time of increasing financial pressures for the council.

### **2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

This proposal affects adult residents who have eligible social care needs which the council has a duty to meet, as well as their families and carers. More personalised care has the potential to meet their needs more effectively, facilitate greater independence for longer and reduce the pressure on carers.

Brent Council Adult Social Care and Customer Services staff will be required to be active advocates for Direct Payments and take on more responsibility for understanding the Direct Payment process, how it affects residents and what form of care would be appropriate for service users.

The council engages an external provider to provide support services, Penderels Trust, and this proposal will result in higher demand for their services.

### **3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

Some aspects of Direct Payments may be more challenging for those with particular equality characteristics. The additional responsibilities, e.g. to act as an employer if service users wish to employ a Personal Assistant, can be more challenging for certain equality groups such as those with particular mental health issues, learning disabilities, or for some older residents. However, this is mitigated by several factors: Accepting Direct Payments is a choice for service users or their carers and traditional care remains an option; those who

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

wish to receive Direct Payments can choose to have someone else manage them on their behalf; if no friend or family member is available to do this, Penderels Trust can manage Direct Payments on their behalf instead; and finally, support commissioned from Penderels Trust is available to help service users get set up and assist them with Direct Payments at any point.

Direct Payments can be managed via telephone or an online portal, so those with visual or aural impairments should still find it possible to choose to receive them and manage Direct Payments themselves if desired.

The possibility of greater personalisation means that, for example, those with disabilities or different preferences relating to ethnicity, religion or cultural beliefs can choose services that are better suited to their needs, having a positive impact compared to traditional service provision.

### **3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted**

No, due to the mitigating factors listed above the proposal will not have a disproportionate impact when considered as a whole.

### **3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

No, these services are already offered.

### **3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

The Adult Social Care department by its nature deals with those with eligible needs, all of whom would fall under certain equality groups.

### **3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

No, this is a continuation of existing policy that aims to provide greater choice and flexibility in the services offered.

### **3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives?**

Direct Payments relates to two objectives from Brent's Equality Strategy Action Plan.

Objective 2 is "to involve our communities effectively". When used creatively, Direct Payments can result in individuals feeling more involved in their community and better able to take part in civic and community life.

Object 4 is "to ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect". Direct Payments allows more responsive, individualised methods of meeting different needs.

### **Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?**

**Yes/No**

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

<b>Reference:</b>	DOE002a
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	Children & Young People
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Ruth Moher

<b>Savings Proposals:</b>	CYP Efficiency savings - Early Help Transformation
---------------------------	--

**1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

Savings will be achieved through three main work-streams: 1. More effective co-ordination and signposting and to early intervention services delivered by partners including schools and the voluntary sector; 2. Improved use of research to ensure a greater strategic focus on high impact interventions and more effective assessment of individual need. Savings will be achieved by reducing delivery of low impact or repeat interventions; 3. Planned structural change across CYP. In the first instance this will enable the delivery of a more coherent offer which is expected to reduce demand for high cost services. Any reduction in demand will then enable a further reduction in headcount.

**2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

Staff will be affected by a likely reduction in headcount and changes of line management and working practices.

Residents who use existing services may be affected. There could be positive effects as effective and co-ordinated early intervention which will build resilience and independence, which will in turn move cases out of high risk and high cost services. As far as possible there will be a one worker to one family approach.

There may also be negative impacts as existing services change, reducing both the way services are delivered and the resource that is available to deliver them.

**3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

Yes it is likely that the greatest impact will be on children, women and those from lower socio economic groups. It is too early at this stage to determine if this will be positive or negative

**3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted**

Yes as above

**3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

It is likely that this will be the case although difficult to know until more detailed proposals are drawn up

**3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

Early Help services tend to focus on disadvantaged children and young people

## **Equality Analysis Screening Forms**

### **3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

It is too early to say at this stage

### **3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? - Yes**

- To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect
- To develop and sustain a skilled and committed workforce able to meet the needs of all local people

### **Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?**

Not at this stage. This will be reconsidered once more detailed proposals are put forward.



## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

<b>Reference:</b>	DOE002b
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	Children & Young People
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Ruth Moher

<b>Savings Proposals:</b>	CYP efficiency savings – Signs of Safety and Social worker recruitment
---------------------------	--

**1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

The proposal is to decrease the depts. reliance on agency social workers, replacing them with permanent staff who are less expensive and offer more continuity of care to the families with which they work. This is linked to improving the skills base of staff, through ongoing investment in the Signs of Safety approach

**2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

Service users are the main group affected by the proposed changes, but this will only be positively. All affected groups (service users, stakeholders, partners etc) will be positively affected by better continuity of staff and the stronger skills base of that group

**3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

No. There is no discernible difference in equality characteristics between agency and permanent social workers

**3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted**

No

**3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

No

**3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

No

**3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

No

**3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? - Yes**

- To develop and sustain a skilled and committed workforce able to meet the needs of all local people

**Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?**

No

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

<b>Reference:</b>	DOE002c
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	Children & Young People
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Ruth Moher
<b>Savings Proposals:</b>	CYP efficiency savings – Regionalising Adoption

**1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

The Education and Adoption Bill currently within parliament proposes the creation of regional adoption agencies. The London Adoption Board is leading the scoping arrangements to determine the future shape and scale of adoption work across London in order to respond to the requirements of the proposed legislation. It is likely that Brent's adoption service will be combined within a regional or sub-regional agency with the timeframe for achieving this to be determined by the end of this reporting year. A regional agency will provide a more streamlined marketing, recruitment and assessment process for adopters that will reduce timescales. A more co-ordinated offer regarding post-adoption support will ensure families receive services better tailored to individual need. A further intention of the creation of a regional agency will be to increase the timeliness of adoptive placements for children.

**2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

Staff working within adoption services will be affected by the proposals as they are likely to result in a reduction in posts. Residents will not be affected by proposals as the same level of service will be provided, although delivered differently. External stakeholders (Voluntary Adoption Agencies) will be involved in the creation of regional adoption agencies and are partners in the creation of these bodies.

**3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

No as there is no current proposal to reduce the current level of service to members of the public. Potential staffing reductions will have a disproportionate impact upon females who constitute the majority of staff working within adoption services.

**3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted**  
See 3.1 above.

**3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

Yes, adoption services for children and families will be delivered differently.

**3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

No

**3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

This is unlikely. Further detail will be available once the plan to produce a regional adoption agency is known before the end of this reporting year.

## **Equality Analysis Screening Forms**

### **3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? - Yes**

- To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect
- To develop and sustain a skilled and committed workforce able to meet the needs of all local people

### **Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?**

Not at this stage. This should be reconsidered once the regional adoption agency plan for London is completed.

# Equality Analysis Screening Forms

## Civic Enterprise

<b>Reference:</b>	CE001
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Civic Enterprise
<b>Service(s):</b>	Support Planning, Reablement
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Councillor Hirani

<b>Savings Proposals:</b>	Additional Continuing Health Care contributions
---------------------------	---

**1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

The proposal is to deliver £400k efficiencies in 16/17 and 17/18 by securing Continuing Health Care (CHC) Funding for individuals currently funded by social care, where there needs have increase and they meet the CHC eligibility criteria.

Any impact would be positive as if full or part health funding is agreed, if the person is subject to paying a financial contribution this would reduce/stop.

**2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

This relates to all adults who are eligible for social care who have/develop complex health needs.

**3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

No

**3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted**

No

**3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

No

**3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

No

**3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

No

**3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? - Yes**

- To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect

**Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?**

No

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

<b>Reference:</b>	CE002
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Civic Enterprise
<b>Service(s):</b>	Across Departments
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Pavey

<b>Savings Proposals:</b>	<p>This saving proposal focuses on two key areas:</p> <p><b>Revenue Generation</b> - to be sought from following areas:-</p> <p><u>Advertising</u> (£300K) – examination has identified opportunities to increase advertising and revenue through increasing the number of on street (large and small format) billboards, lamppost banners, advertising on the council's website / intranet and roundabout sponsorship.</p> <p><u>Wireless</u> (£150K) – put in place concession contracts for the installation of wireless equipment on lampposts and spaces and review current position on rooftops.</p> <p><b>Fees and charges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A complete review of all fees and charges will be undertaken.</li> <li>• Recently published CIPFA guide on Income Maximisation will be used to assist to ensure that all costs that can be properly be levied are identified to ensure full cost recovery.</li> <li>• Review will include analysis to determine how Brent's charges compare to other councils and other competitors in the market – initial study of 8 areas will be undertaken to show Brent's relative positions.</li> </ul>
---------------------------	---

### 1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

The objectives of the proposal include generating additional income of £300k from advertising and sponsorship through increasing the number of on street (large and small format) billboards, lamppost banner, advertising on the council's website/intranet and roundabout sponsorship.

The proposal also includes putting in place concession contracts for the installation of wireless equipment on lampposts and review current position on rooftops and small spaces/buildings, to generate £210k.

In addition, a review of fees and charges will also be carried out to compare Brent to neighbouring authorities in order to bring our charges in line, including for services that were previously free, with a view to raising £1.99m of additional revenue.

### 2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

There are potential impacts for residents, local businesses and visitors to the borough. This includes both potential positive and negative impacts.

Additional advertising space will provide opportunities for local businesses and partners. Increasing advertising on the council's website may have potential negative impacts for some web users using assistive technology as they may not view the browser in the same

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

format or find the display more difficult to navigate. This could potentially impact people with a learning disability or other disability. The website is a source of information and advice for local residents and different needs of individuals will be considered to minimise any potential negative impact in increasing advertising.

The proposal to install wireless equipment on lampposts will offer limited free access to wireless for residents and visitors to the borough in the area in which it operates, providing new opportunities to access the internet on a mobile basis.

A review of fees and charges could have potential negative impact for residents. Details of any potential equality impacts are not known at this stage. An individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review process.

### **3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

As outlined above, the proposal for advertising on the council's website could impact on people with a learning disability or other disability. Impacts of the review of fees and charges are not known at this stage and will be assessed through an individual EA carried out as part of the review process.

### **3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted**

It is not known at this stage. An individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review of fees and charges.

### **3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

The proposal could change fees and charges for services, including services currently offered at no charge to the service user. As the review has not commenced, the details are not known at this stage and an individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review of fees and charges.

### **3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

It is not known at this stage. An individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review of fees and charges.

### **3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

It is not known at this stage. An individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review of fees and charges.

### **3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? - Yes**

- To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect

### **Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?**

An EA is not required for the wireless but will be carried out for the advertising. An individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review of fees and charges.

## **Equality Analysis Screening Forms**

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

<b>Reference:</b>	CE003
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Civic Enterprise
<b>Service(s):</b>	Digital Services
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Pavey

<b>Savings Proposals:</b>	Further IT sales
---------------------------	------------------

**1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

This saving proposal is themed under Enterprise and follows on from the successful bid to provide ICT services to the LGA. In addition, Brent is in the process of establishing a shared service with Lewisham which will formally commence in April 2016 covering infrastructure support and will be extended to other applications in 2017/18.

Digital Services are looking to offer ICT services on a commercial basis to other organisations. The service is already in discussion with a number of London boroughs that have expressed an interest in the type of services Brent could provide for them and are looking to develop these discussions with a view of having a tailored service in place for April 2018.

**2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

No negative impact identified by the service. However, consideration should be given on the impact of staff both as service providers and clients, particularly where there is heavy reliance on self-service. This will be considered as part of the procurement process based on the type of service Brent will offer to individual boroughs.

**3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

Staff using AT, staff who have LDD and staff over 50 who are usually more affected from self-service.

**3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted**

Age

Disability

**3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

The proposal would change the ways staff accessed services (see point 3.1 above).

**3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

No

**3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

See point 3.1 above

**3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? – N/A**

**Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?**

**Yes/No**



## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

<b>Reference:</b>	CE004
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Civic Enterprise
<b>Service(s):</b>	Parking and Lighting/Parking
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Southwood

<b>Savings Proposals:</b>	Eliminate the additional overhead costs of the Serco parking contract incurred by LB Brent.
---------------------------	---

- 1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

The proposal is to renegotiate the allocation of overhead cost that is chargeable to each of the three client boroughs with respect to the Serco Parking Contract.

- 2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

This is a financial and contractual matter that affects no service users.

- 3. Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

No

- 4. Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups?**

No

- 5. Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

No

- 6. Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

No

- 7. Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

No

- 8. Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? – N/A**

**Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?**

No

# Equality Analysis Screening Forms

## Making Our Money Go Further

<b>Reference:</b>	MGF001
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Making Our Money Go Further
<b>Service(s):</b>	Procurement
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Pavey

<b>Savings Proposals:</b>	<p>The key area for savings are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Price reductions on contract renewal – 161 contracts in scope:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>63 contracts above £500k with expiry dates between 2016/17 - 2018/19 will look to be renewed with a savings target of 10%</li> <li>98 contracts below £500k with expiry dates between 2016/17 - 2018/19 will look to be renewed with a savings target of 10%</li> <li>Savings on end of street lighting PFI – the PFI street lighting contract contains clauses that require the contractor, on contract termination, to have lamppost columns in place which have a minimum 5 year life. Together with a programme, currently on-going, of installing LED lights and a central management system, this provides the opportunity to replace the existing contract requirements with a repairs only contract.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---------------------------	---

### **1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

The proposal is to apply a 10 per cent savings target against current contract prices. It is proposed that this will be applied to 161 contracts due for renewal over the next three years (2016/17 - 2018/19). This includes 63 contracts above £500k and 98 contracts below £500k. In addition savings to be achieved on the end of the Streetlight PFI contract by replacing the current contract requirements by a repairs only contract.

### **2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

The full details of the potential impacts are not known at this stage but relate to commissioned services, including Adult Social Care and Children and Young People's services. The proposal could therefore have potential impact on residents, staff and external providers.

A total of 161 contracts will be affected, including:

Area	No. of Contracts	
	Above £500k (2016/17 to 2018/19)	below £500k (2016/17 to 2018/19)
Adults Social Care	16	12
Chief Operating Officer's Department	33	50
Children & Young People's Service	10	26
Public Health Grant	2	2

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Area	No. of Contracts	
Regeneration and Growth	2	8
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>98</b>

### 3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

It is not known at this stage. EAs and consultation will be completed as required during the contract negotiations. Relevant contracts must incorporate equality and diversity requirements, with monitoring arrangements in place.

### 3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted

It is not known at this stage. Individual EAs and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each contract negotiation.

### 3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

There is a potential that the proposal could change current commissioned services for Adult Social Care and Children and Young People's services but the details are not is not known at this stage. Individual EAs and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each contract negotiation.

### 3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

It is not known at this stage. Individual EAs and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each contract negotiation.

### 3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

It is not known at this stage. Individual EAs and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each contract negotiation.

### 3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives?

The proposal relates to the following equality objective:

- To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect

### Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

Yes - individual EAs and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each contract negotiation.

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

<b>Reference:</b>	MGF002
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Making our money go further
<b>Service(s):</b>	Transportation
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Southwood

<b>Savings Proposals:</b>	This saving is a 10% reduction in combined budgets for core highways maintenance work within the Lohac contract and for separate reactive maintenance work.
---------------------------	---

**1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

The proposal is to make a saving of 10% in budgets for highways reactive repairs (roads, pavements, signs, street furniture, markings), gulley cleansing, inspections and call outs. This will require reduced spend and fewer remedial works undertaken. It is intended to be countered by increased investment so that repairs are less necessary and less frequent.

**2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

Any resident, business owner or visitor to the borough, particularly road users and pedestrians, who will have a concern about the state and condition of the borough's roads and pavements.

**3. Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

Yes

- Age
- Disability
- Pregnancy/maternity

**4. Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups?**

Yes

Elderly and disabled pedestrians and road users rely on well maintained road and footway surfaces. Any deterioration can present safety hazards for these vulnerable users. Similarly, uneven surfaces will present access difficulties for those with small children and pushchairs, prams, etc. and for those who rely on mobility scooters for transport.

**5. Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

No

**6. Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

No

**7. Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

Yes

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

### 8. Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives?

Yes

1. To know and understand our communities
2. To involve our communities effectively

To ensure local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect – Will ensure that a high quality service is provided that is mindful of equality considerations and meets the individual residents and visitors.

### Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

Yes

# Equality Analysis Screening Forms

## Council Tax

<b>Reference:</b>	n/a
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Council Tax
<b>Service(s):</b>	All
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Pavey

<b>Savings Proposals:</b>	<p>It is proposed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Agree an overall 3.99% increase in the Council's element of council tax for 2016/17 with 2% as a precept for Adult Social Care and a 1.99% general increase.</li><li>2. Agree that if the 2% adult social care precept in the Council's element of council tax is rejected, Adult Social Care expenditure will be increased by £1.3m in 2016/17 rather than the increase proposed (£3.2m).</li></ol>
---------------------------	---

### Stage 1 Screening Data

#### **1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

The Council is faced with severe cuts in its budgets in the next two years and in order to help overcome this it is proposed to:

3. Agree an overall 3.99% increase in the Council's element of council tax for 2016/17 with 2% as a precept for Adult Social Care and a 1.99% general increase.
4. Agree that if the 2% adult social care precept in the Council's element of council tax is rejected, Adult Social Care expenditure will be increased by £1.3m in 2016/17 rather than the increase proposed (£3.2m).

A major element of the Council's spend is on social care, and Brent faces considerable demographic challenges over the coming years. The Office for National Statistics projects that from 2015 to 2019 the number of residents over 75 years old in Brent will grow by nearly 8%, and the number of those under 15 years old by 4.5%. This is much faster than the population as a whole, which is nonetheless forecast to grow by 3.5% at a time when the Council's funding is being significantly reduced. Officers estimate that by 2020 over half of the Council's budget will be spent on social care.

Without the proposed additional Council Tax increase of 2% described above the Adult Social Care budget will only be increased by £1.3m (instead of by £3.2m), which could pose challenges to the service to meet growing demand of current and future service users. If the above proposal is approved, however, this will mean that for those households who do not receive any Council Tax support the Council Tax for a Band D property will increase by £23.30 annually, or by £1.94 per month, or by £0.45 per week. The increase in Council Tax will impact on all households, apart from those who receive 100% Council Tax support.

For the most financially vulnerable families the Council Tax support scheme will act as a significant mitigation to the impact of increased Council Tax. Those claimants of pensionable age may be entitled to council tax support equating to 100% of their council tax liability,

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

whereas working age claimants may be entitled to up to 80% of their council tax liability. For those working age claimants in receipt of maximum council tax support they will only be required to pay 20% of the full bill, and so the cost of the increase will be £0.09p per week at Band D. However, some households on low incomes who fall outside the Council Tax support threshold could potentially be affected by the Council Tax increase.

This Equality Analysis is looking at the impacts of the proposal (both positive and negative) on affected groups with protected characteristics.

### **2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

If the 2% additional Council Tax increase for Adult Social Care is approved, the budget of Adult Social Care services will be increased by further £1.9m (from £1.3m to £3.2m) which will enable the service to meet increasing demand of current and future service users who are among the most vulnerable members of Brent's community.

If the additional 1.99% additional Council Tax increase is approved, this will generate an additional £1.9m. Given that the council faces reductions in spending, this additional money is effectively being used to reduce the amount of savings that need to be found in 2016/17 and future years. If rejected, the council's budget would be reduced by £1.9m from the proposal, and additional reductions in expenditure would need to be identified. This could impact residents, staff and external stakeholders.

However, if this proposal is approved, it will affect all households in Brent (117,140) that will see their Council Tax bills increase, unless they are receiving 100% Council Tax support. Currently, 25% (29,100 households out of the 117,140) of households in Brent receive full or partial Council Tax support, which means that they will receive full or partial protection for the increase. In addition those households where there is only one adult resident receive a 25% reduction in their bill so will therefore see a weekly increase of £0.34 rather than £0.45 at band D; there are over 34,500 households receiving a 25% discount

### **3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

If the 2% additional Council Tax increase for Adult Social Care is approved, the budget of Adult Social Care services will be increased by further £1.9m (from £1.26m to £3.16m) which will have a positive impact on the most vulnerable members of Brent's community such as older adults, (particularly women who have longer life expectancy, but are also more likely to have caring responsibilities), and disabled people.

If the additional 1.99% additional Council Tax increase is approved, this will generate an additional £1.9m. Given that the council faces reductions in spending, this additional money is effectively being used to reduce the amount of savings that need to be found in 2016/17 and future years. If rejected, the council's budget would be reduced by £1.9m from the proposal, and additional reductions in expenditure would need to be identified. This could impact residents, staff and external stakeholders. The groups that are most likely to be affected by a reduction in the proposed budget are children and young people, older people and women.

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

The proposed Council Tax increase will affect households in Brent in different ways based on their financial circumstances. However low income households are likely to be protected as they will see increases in their Council Tax support which will either offset in full or partially this increase.

### **3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted**

#### **Yes – both positively and negatively**

**Positive impact** on Adult Social Care service users: older adults, particularly women who have longer life expectancy but are also more likely to have caring responsibilities, disabled people, residents on low incomes who might be experiencing multiple disadvantage.

A major element of the Council's spend is on social care, and Brent faces considerable demographic challenges over the coming years. The Office for National Statistics projects that from 2015 to 2019 the number of residents over 75 years old in Brent will grow by nearly 8%. This is much faster than the population as a whole, which is nonetheless forecast to grow by 3.5% at a time when the Council's funding is being significantly reduced. Officers estimate that by 2020 over half of the Council's budget will be spent on social care.

If the 2% additional Council Tax increase for Adult Social Care is not agreed then the budget for the Adult Social Care department will need to be reduced by £1.9m, which could pose significant challenges to the service to meet growing demand of current and future service users. Adult Social Care service users are some of the most vulnerable members of Brent's community such as older adults, particularly women who have longer life expectancy but are also more likely to have caring responsibilities, disabled people, residents on low incomes who might be experiencing multiple disadvantage.

The increase in council tax for general use should have a positive impact on some equality groups as it prevents an additional reduction of £1.9m in the council's budget. Without a specific alternative proposal the exact benefit to specific groups of residents, staff and external stakeholders is uncertain.

**Negative impact** on households living on low incomes that fall outside of the threshold for Council Tax support (socio-economic disadvantage)

The proposal will increase the financial pressure on those households, particularly working age men and women in single or multiple households, earning just above the threshold to qualify for Council Tax and/or Welfare Assistance support. Brent Council does not hold detailed data on the incomes of council tax payers.. It is therefore difficult to predict the impact on most of the equality groups as for many households with reasonable incomes, £0.45 a week at band D will have minimal impact.

Currently, 25% (29,100 households out of the 117,140) of households in Brent receive full or partial Council Tax support, which means that they will receive full or partial protection for the increase. Those households who receive partial Council Tax support will see pro rata increases in their Council Tax. Working age claimants who receive 80% Council Tax support, for example, will see an increase in their bills equivalent to 20% of the increase, i.e. £4.66 for a Band D property or nine pence a week.



## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

The remaining households who are not in receipt of Council Tax support will see a weekly increase in their Council Tax bills ranging from £0.30 for Band A property to £0.89 for Band H property.

The households who are not eligible for Council Tax support will see the Brent Council element of their bill increase by 3.99%. However this will be offset by a reduction in the GLA precept, so the net increase is not 3.99% but 1.72%. This equates to £23.30 annually for a Band D property, or £1.94 per month, or by £0.45 per week. If they are also in receipt of a 25% single person discount this will reduce the increase by 25%

The table below shows the increase for each Council Tax band:

Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Annual Increase	£15.53	£18.12	£20.71	<b>£23.30</b>	£28.46	£33.66	£38.83	£46.60
Weekly Increase	£0.30	£0.35	£0.40	<b>£0.45</b>	£0.55	£0.65	£0.75	£0.89
<b>No of properties</b>	<b>4,391</b> 3.7%	<b>12,822</b> 10.9%	<b>34,935</b> 29.8%	<b>33,316</b> 28.4%	21,816 18.6%	6,263 5.3%	3,348 2.9%	249 0.2%
<b>No. receiving a 25% discount</b>	<b>2,215</b>	<b>6,676</b>	<b>13,490</b>	<b>7,487</b>	3,594	814	371	13
Accounts subject to recovery (sample)	11.6%	16.2%	35.0%	<b>21.3%</b>	10.3%	2.9%	2.4%	0.3%

The table above shows that almost two thirds (72.8%) of households will see a weekly increase of £0.45 or less. It should be noted, however, that the analysis of a random sample of accounts subject to recovery action shows that proportionately more accounts in Bands A, B and C are subject to recovery action. This would suggest that households living in lower banded properties find it more difficult to pay and so, although the proposed increase for these property bands is £0.40 or less per week (or £20.71 or less annually), these households could potentially be more affected by the increase in Council Tax if they are not in receipt of Council Tax support.

Those households living in Bands D – H will in most cases be in a better position to manage the proposed Council Tax increase, although there might be a minority of households on low incomes who fall outside the Council Tax support threshold and could therefore be affected by the increase.

A key limit on the negative impact on particular groups is that so many households will contribute a small amount extra each week, as shown by the figures above.

### 3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

## Equality Analysis Screening Forms

The additional 2% increase in Council Tax will help maintain Adult Social Care services used by the most vulnerable members of Brent's community, and will help ensure that the increasing demand on those services is met.

If the proposal is rejected, the overall expenditure for Adult Social Care will be reduced by £1.9m, which could pose challenges to the service to meet growing demand of current and future service users. Failure to meet the increasing demand and diverse needs of current and future service users would have a potential negative impact on those most at need.

The increase in council tax for general use should have a positive impact on some equality groups as it prevents an additional reduction of £1.9m in the council's budget. Without a specific alternative proposal the exact benefit to specific groups of residents, staff and external stakeholders is uncertain, but a reduction in budget at short notice will limit the scope of the council to reduce the impact on services used by vulnerable groups of people.

While the Council Tax proposal will increase the financial pressure on some households, the Council Tax support scheme will partially or fully mitigate this impact for those households who are living on low incomes and are eligible for Council Tax support. Further, single households will have the impact mitigated by the 25% reduction for single households.

### **3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

There is a relatively high proportion of older people living with income deprivation in Brent. The borough is 14th worst in the country (326 local authorities) for older people affected by income deprivation.

The additional 2% increase in Council Tax will help maintain Adult Social Care services used by the most vulnerable members of Brent's community such as older adults, particularly women who have longer life expectancy but are also more likely to have caring responsibilities, disabled people, residents on low incomes who might be experiencing multiple disadvantage.

Many of the council's services are targeted towards vulnerable groups, therefore the 1.99% rise in council tax will help to maintain these services, and reduce the impact of cuts to local government funding on service users.

The proposal, on the other hand, will increase the financial pressure on those households, including working age men and women in single or multiple households, earning just above the threshold to qualify for Council Tax and/or Welfare Assistance support. However the impact on pensioners, disabled people and working age households who currently receive 100% or partial Council Tax support will be mitigated due to the corresponding increases in the support provided to them.

### **3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

Yes

### **3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives?**

Yes

## **Equality Analysis Screening Forms**

Objective 4: To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect

### **Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?**

No - the costs of the council tax increase will be spread widely between households across the borough, and there is already significant mitigation in place to protect the most vulnerable groups, for example: council tax support, single person's discount, and discounts for some disabled people. Demographic pressures in the form of rising numbers of children and older people in the borough combined with reductions in funding from central government mean serious risk of a significant increase in inequality falling disproportionately on some protected groups, especially older people, women, and disabled people if council tax is not raised.

**4. Use the comments box below to give brief details of what further information you will need to complete a Full Equality Analysis.**

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## **Summary of Issues Raised at Consultation events**

Seven consultation events were held between 12 January 2016 and 3 February 2016 at locations throughout the borough.

The meetings had the following levels of attendance:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
12 January	Brent Connects Wembley	48
14 January	Budget consultation	7
19 January	Brent Connects Kilburn & Kensal	38
25 January	Budget consultation	14
1 February	Brent Connects Willesden	40
2 February	Brent Connects Harlesden	30
3 February	Brent Connects Kingsbury & Kenton	37

The Leader of the Council delivered a presentation outlining the financial position and the difficult budget choices faced by the Council. The Leader and deputy Leader then took questions from the audience and provided answers, supported by senior officers where appropriate for matters of technical detail.

A summary of the most common issues raised by the public is set out below:

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Points raised</b>
Council Tax	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clarification was sought on the size of the tax-base increase and how this affected income</li><li>• Concern was raised over the impact of the planned increase in council tax on residents who receive council tax support and what would be in place to assist those most in need</li><li>• Clarification was sought over how much revenue would be raised by increasing council tax</li></ul>
Business Rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clarification was requested about how business rates retention would work, and what its impact would be on Brent</li></ul>
Central government Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concern was raised at the level of cuts imposed on some local authorities over others</li><li>• Clarification was sought on what local authorities are doing to challenge the cuts</li></ul>

Council assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern was raised as to the size of Brent Civic Centre and if it was wholly necessary</li> <li>• Clarification was sought on how many floors of Brent Civic Centre are rented out and if more could be done</li> <li>• Questions were raised as to the extent of empty council properties and what was being done</li> </ul>
Streets and Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern was raised on the issues of maintaining pavements and repairing potholes</li> <li>• A suggestion was made to switch off alternate street lights, or dim them</li> </ul>
Budget setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification was sought on whether these were the full list of proposals</li> <li>• Clarification was sought on whether the budget setting exercise received independent / expert oversight</li> </ul>
Council staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern was raised as to the number of council staff and whether “delaying” management had been considered</li> <li>• Questions were raised regarding the pay of directors, and whether pay of directors had been cut</li> <li>• Questions were raised as to the cost of supporting the Mayor’s office</li> </ul>
Section 106 monies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification was sought as to where Section 106 monies are spent</li> </ul>
Front line services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern was raised at the level of cuts in Adult Social Care</li> </ul>
Financial management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification was sought over the value of reserves held by the council</li> </ul>
Income generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was suggested that the council should be finding ways to increase income instead of increasing council tax</li> <li>• It was suggested that peer to peer lending could generate additional income for the council</li> </ul>
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The availability of housing for residents on low incomes within the borough was raised as an issue</li> </ul>

Ten people responded to the online consultation. These suggested that the following service areas should be protected from further cuts

- Road Safety
- Looked After Children
- Activities for the Elderly
- Community events for all cultures and faiths
- Keeping Brent Safe
- Local libraries
- Encouraging entrepreneurship and supporting new business
- Refuse collections and street cleaning
- Planning enforcement
- Street tree planting
- Adult Social Care
- Supporting People

One person suggested that there could be further savings in refuse collection if the limits on the number of bins per household were enforced. In terms of rises in council tax one person was in favour and two people were against.

All of these consultation responses are important. Members need to have regard to them, but are not obliged to follow the suggestions made. It is relevant to note that the consultees are, statistically speaking, “self selecting” and therefore not necessarily reflective of opinion in the borough as a whole, nor are they necessarily statistically significant.

**This page is intentionally left blank**